

Appendix F. Outreach and Scoping

The following text was added:

Community and Stakeholder Meetings and Briefings

A series of 38 meetings and briefings with various community and stakeholder groups were held to inform the public and gather comments on the alternatives. While these meetings varied in format depending on the group, most included a presentation including an overview of the project, an introduction to the environmental review process, an explanation of the various alternatives under study in that area, and a question and answer session.

The following are a list of these community and stakeholder meetings during this period:

- November 5 – Mountain View Council Study Session on Context Sensitive Solutions
- November 5 – SAMCEDA Meeting
- November 9 – South Beach, Rincon Hill, Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
- November 10 – South Bay Transportation Officials Association Annual Meeting
- November 10 – Dog Patch Neighborhood Association
- November 13 – VTA Management Meeting
- November 16 – Burlingame City Council
- November 18 – Meeting with UCSF Mission Bay Staff
- November 18 – San Bruno Rotary Club
- November 18 – Sustainable Menlo Park
- November 19 – Portola Neighborhood Steering Committee
- November 19 – North Fair Oaks Community Council
- November 30 – Kansas Street Neighborhood Association
- December 2 – Esprit Park Homeowners Association
- December 7 – San Jose Good Neighbor Committee
- December 10 – Mountain View Community Workshop
- December 11 – Leadership Group of Redwood City
- December 12 – Visitation Valley Planning Alliance
- December 14 – San Mateo/Hillsborough Community Meeting
- December 16 – South Beach, Rincon Hill, Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
- January 7 – Harbor Industrial Association
- January 8 – Leadership San Mateo, Foster City, Burlingame, and Hillsborough
- January 11 – Hillsborough City Council
- January 13 – Redwood City / San Mateo Chamber of Commerce
- January 14 – San Jose Community Workshop
- January 18 – Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Association
- January 21 – San Mateo Homeowners Association
- January 26 – Bayview Merchants Association
- January 26 – Potrero Hill Boosters Association
- January 27 – San Francisco County Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee
- January 30 - Shasta Hanchett Park Neighborhood Association
- February 1 – San Jose Good Neighbor Committee
- February 1 – Sunnyvale Neighborhood Association
- February 16 – Santa Clara Council High Speed Rail Study Session
- February 22 – 400 Beale Street Homeowners Association
- March 9 – SAMCEDA Housing and Transportation Subcommittee
- March 11 – San Mateo Unified High School District Board
- March 16 – League of Women Voters of North and Central San Mateo County

Below is an overview of general feedback received during these meetings:

- There was concern about the potential noise and visual impacts generated by the project, especially as it relates to above-grade alternatives.
- There was concern about potential impacts to properties along the right of way, especially in those areas where the right of way is narrow.
- Many comments expressed a preference for below-grade alternatives. Several communities asked that below-grade options be added for further consideration.
- There was a strong request to minimize the use of elevated retained fill berms.
- There were concerns about the overall cost of the system.

Legislative Staff Briefings

A total of three meetings were held on December 1 and 3, 2010 to brief legislative staff on the status of the project and the development of the alternatives. One meeting was held in each of the three counties (San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara) and staff representing all county supervisors, members of the state senate or assembly and U.S. congress whose districts are included in the section, the governor, and the U.S. senators were invited to participate. The meeting concluded with a question and answer session. See Table 8 for a summary of participation in each of the three meetings:

Table 8: Legislative Staff Briefings Participation			
	San Francisco County December 1, 2009	San Mateo County December 3, 2009	Santa Clara County December 3, 2009
Federal	Office of Sen. Feinstein Office of Sen. Boxer Office of Rep. Pelosi	Office of Rep. Eshoo	Office of Rep. Honda
State	Office of the Governor Office of Sen. Leno Office of Asm. Amiano	Office of Sen. Simitian Office of Asm. Fong Office of Asm. Hill Office of Asm. Ma Office of Asm. Ruskin	Office of Asm. Coto Office of Asm. Beall Office of Asm. Fong
County	Office of Sup. Chiu Office of Sup. Daly	Office of Sup. Church Office of Sup. Gordon Office of Sup. Groom Office of Sup. Tissier	Office of Sup. Cortese Office of Sup. Yeager
Other Participants		CARRD	Working Partnerships

Technical Working Group and Policymaker Working Group Conference Call

A conference call was held on January 28, 2010 to brief TWG and PWG members, as well as interested members of the public on project updates including the progress on the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis, the development of informational materials relating to Context Sensitive Solutions and the recent award of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to the project, and the potential for use of those funds on the San Francisco to San Jose corridor. The call ended with a question and answer session.

Individual Agency Meetings

In order to facilitate coordination with participating agencies on the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report, the project team conducted one-on-one or small group meetings with each of the municipalities along the San Francisco to San Jose corridor as well as meetings with some of the major transportation agencies impacted by the project in February and March 2010. The purpose of these meetings was to present further refinement of the initial alternative concepts, to explain the organization of the Preliminary Report, give an overview of key findings and discuss the project timeline.

The following is a list of the city, county and transportation agencies that the project team met with:

February 1 – Mountain View
February 1 – San Jose
February 5 – Santa Clara
February 8 – Belmont
February 9 – Burlingame
February 9 – Palo Alto
February 11 – Santa Clara
February 12 – San Mateo
February 16 – Brisbane, South San Francisco and San Bruno
February 16 – San Carlos
February 17 – Redwood City
February 19 – Sunnyvale
February 19 – Menlo Park
February 22 – BART
February 22 – VTA
February 23 – Atherton
February 25 – Caltrans
February 25 – Millbrae
February 26 – County of San Mateo (North Fair Oaks)

Technical Working Groups – Meeting #3

The project team met for a third time with TWG representatives on March 23, 2010 at the Samtrans offices in San Carlos. Representatives of the cities/counties, resource agencies and transportation agencies all participated in the same meeting. The focus of these meetings was to prepare the group for the release of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report and to discuss community engagement on the document. The group asked for a meeting immediately following the release of the Report and asked that meetings be arranged more frequently.

Context Sensitive Solutions Toolkit

The CSS Toolkit was designed and published online both as a resource tool and as a means of providing feedback to the project team. The toolkit contains two parts:

1. Resource Documents – these documents seek to explain basic project information in common language as well as to summarize feedback to date.
 - a. Issues, Values and Goals Matrix
 - b. Opportunities Matrix
 - c. Systemwide Context
 - d. Grade Separation Methods/Vertical Options Context

- e. Glossary of Terms and Acronyms
2. Exercises – these worksheets are developed to provide a framework for discussion of the project and as a means of gathering input
 - a. Exercise #1: Mapping the Context allows users to view parcel maps of the corridor and use a set of symbols to identify sensitive areas, concerns or opportunities.
 - b. Exercise #2: Grade Separation Methods identifies a series of community goal areas and asks uses to evaluate the various vertical alternatives against those community-identified goals. A simplified version of Exercise #2 was utilized to gather feedback at several of the community workshops.

CHSRA Board Presentation of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report

The project team presented the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report to the High Speed Rail Authority Board on April 8, 2010 at their regular monthly meeting. This particular meeting was held in San Jose, which allowed several members of the public from the project area to participate and offer their comments on the Report. The Report was accepted by the Board.

Policymaker Working Group – Meeting #2

The project team met for a second time with the PWG representatives on April 8, 2010, following the CHSRA Board meeting, at the Samtrans offices in San Carlos. The purpose of the meeting was to present the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report and answer questions relating to the document.

Technical Working Groups – Meeting #4

The project team met for a fourth time with TWG representatives on April 12, 2010 at the Burlingame Library. Representatives of the cities/counties, resource agencies and transportation agencies all participated in the same meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to present the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report, to explain the organization and findings of the report, and to answer questions. The group broke out into four smaller groups to review the document in detail with engineering team members. Each city received a three ring binder copy of the document for staff use and copying, a bound copy of the document to place in their library or city hall for the public's use, and all agencies received a digital copy of the report.

Community and Stakeholder Meetings and Briefings

A series of 32 meetings and workshops, with a total of more than 1,500 participants, were held along the corridor to inform the public and gather comments on the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report. Meetings were noticed online at the CHSRA website Calendar, on the Peninsula Rail Program website, and on the websites of local communities, via e-blasts utilizing the project email database, as well as through mailings and other notices in partnership with local communities.

The meeting format was tailored to meet the needs of the community group. Most meetings opened with an Open House format allowing community members together information from project boards, which are attached and team members. All meetings included a presentation by team members and Project Information Handouts were distributed including an Executive Summary of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis in English, Spanish and Chinese. Each meeting also included a Question and Answer session, where community members were encouraged to write their comments or questions on cards which were collected, batched into groups of related questions, and addressed by

team members. In workshop style meetings, a simplified version of Tool Kit Exercise #2 was used to structure discussion and solicit feedback on the alternatives. In order to complete the exercise, the community members were separated into smaller groups. They had the opportunity to ask further, more specific questions in the small groups, learn more about project exhibits and then provide comments on the various vertical alternatives under study in their community. Meetings were staffed with both outreach and engineering team members. As a follow up to these community meetings, the slide presentations and notes were posted online at the Peninsula Rail Program website and shared with community staff, as well as the design team.

The following are a list of these community and stakeholder meetings during this period:

- April 15 – North Fair Oaks Community Council
- April 15 – San Mateo Community Workshop
- April 19 – Rincon Hill, South Beach Citizens Advisory Committee
- April 19 – Burlingame City Council
- April 22 – San Carlos Community Workshop
- April 23 – San Mateo Council of Cities
- April 27 – Palo Alto Community Workshop
- April 28 – Millbrae Community Workshop
- April 29 – Redwood City Community Workshop
- May 3 – Mountain View Community Workshop
- May 4 – Atherton Community Workshop
- May 6 – San Carlos Hot Harvest Nights Farmers Markets (Informational Booth)
- May 12 – Burlingame Community Workshop
- May 13 – San Mateo Community Workshop
- May 13 – Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee
- May 15 – Brisbane, Daly City, Visitation Valley Community Meeting
- May 19 – Santa Clara Community Workshop
- May 25 – Burlingame School District Information Night
- May 26 – Belmont Community Workshop
- May 27 – Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group
- May 27 – San Mateo/Foster City Democratic Club
- June 1 – Menlo Park Community Workshop
- June 8 – San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Workshop
- June 10 – Santa Clara County Roads Commission
- June 10 – Sunnyvale Community Workshop
- June 15 – Sunnyvale City Council
- June 15 – South San Francisco City Council and Community Workshop
- June 16 – San Mateo Community Workshop
- June 17 – North Fair Oaks Community Workshop
- June 19 – Palo Alto Neighborhood Workshop
- June 21 – San Jose Community Workshop
- June 29 – San Francisco Transportation Authority Board

A summary of comments collected during these meetings is attached (See Attachment 4 – Community Meeting Notes Summary).

Legislative Staff Briefings

A total of three meetings were held on April 29 and May 5, 2010 to brief legislative staff on the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report. One meeting was held in each of the three counties (San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara) and staff representing all county supervisors, members of the state senate or assembly and U.S. congress whose districts are included in the section, the governor, and the U.S. senators were invited to participate.

The meeting concluded with a question and answer session. See Table 9 for a summary of participation in each of the three meetings:

Table 9: Legislative Staff Briefings Participation			
	San Francisco County April 29, 2010	San Mateo County May 5, 2010	Santa Clara County May 5, 2010
Federal	Office of Sen. Feinstein	Office of Sen. Boxer Office of Rep. Eshoo Office of Rep. Speier	Office of Rep. Honda Office of Rep. Lofgren
State	Office of the Governor Office of Sen. Leno Office of Sen. Yee Office of Asm. Amiano Office of Asm. Ma	Office of Sen. Simitian Office of Sen. Yee Office of Asm. Hill	Office of Sen. Alquist Office of Asm. Beall
County	Office of Sup. Maxwell	Office of Sup. Church Office of Sup. Gordon Office of Sup. Groom Office of Sup. Tissier Office of County Mgr. County Planning Dept.	Office of Sup. Cortese Office of Sup. Kniss Office of Sup. Shirakawa Office of Sup. Yeager
Other Participants		UPC Development Company	

Technical Working Groups – Meeting #5

The project team met for a fifth time with TWG representatives on May 13, 2010 at the Downtown Redwood City Library. Representatives of the cities/counties, resource agencies and transportation agencies all participated in the same meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to gather initial comments on the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report and provide opportunities for TWG members to discuss coordinating review and comments on the Report with their neighboring cities or other agencies.

Policymaker Working Group – Meeting #3

The project team met for a third time with the PWG representatives on May 20, 2010 at the Samtrans offices in San Carlos. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Work Plan for the PWG through December 2010, and to discuss opportunities for cities to work together to resolve design issues.

Technical Working Groups – Meeting #6

The project team met for a sixth time with TWG representatives on June 17, 2010 at the San Carlos Library. Representatives of the cities/counties, resource agencies and transportation agencies all participated in the same meeting. The purpose of the meeting was for the members of the TWG to work in smaller groups to developed stitched together corridor-long alternatives.

Policymaker Working Group – Meeting #4

The project team met for a fourth time with the PWG representatives on June 17, 2010 at the San Carlos Library. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss tradeoffs between various goals of the project. As an example, in some

cases, maintaining full Caltrain service may mean that construction periods could be longer. PWG members discussed these tradeoffs and gave initial indications of their priorities among a set of goals.

Office Hours

In order to provide more frequent, less formal discussion of alternatives, the team instituted monthly office hours. The project team set up a temporary work room at the SamTrans offices in San Carlos, and each TWG member was given the opportunity to sign up for a one hour time slot to review current plans, and ask questions on an informal basis. At the request of the TWG members, we plan to host these office hours on a monthly basis through the end of the year.

Attachment 4 – Community Meeting Notes Summary

North Fair Oaks Community Council Meeting, 4/15/10

- Meeting format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer
- Attendance: Nine council members, 35 people, including two attorneys from CC-HSR and Jerry Carlson, city council Atherton, Jim Eggmeyer San Mateo County TWG and County manager
- Main issues/points:
 - Support HST, “but need to be done right”; Equity issues - high local community impact (quality of life and cost) but broad benefit; only at grade and deep tunnel/at-grade alternative - what about trench or cut & cover?
 - Discussion of how to have Dumbarton cross over HST to join Caltrain on west side of tracks, as elevated or at grade with below grade HST and Caltrain with need for wider ROW for transition
 - History of lack of community notification of environmental impacts, i.e. Highway 101 improvements caused flooding of several neighborhoods and city and Caltrans only sent letters saying that they are not responsible for the damage. They want to know in advance and ensure adequate mitigations.

San Mateo Community Workshop, 4/15/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Question & Answer
- Attendance: Approximately 100 residents, several council members and TWG representative Larry Patterson
- Main points/issues:
 - Concerns about impact on Downtown local businesses and surrounding properties (not taken)
 - Preference for underground/cut and cover to minimize blight, property loss and devaluation; construction impacts
 - Concern about funding, cost of project
 - Questions about why not 101 or 280; why not stop in SJ?

Burlingame Council Meeting, 4/19/10

- Meeting format: Council Presentation. Each of the 5 council members took their turn asking questions
- Burlingame Workshop scheduled for 5/12/10.
- Attendees: 150 people
- Main points/issues:
 - Cost of outreach to cities and the expectation that cities might have to pay for a tunnel if that is preferred by the community
 - A lot of business plan questions, especially about the subsidy/guarantee issue; how can transit be profitable
 - What does it take for communities to get the solutions they want, given the price tag, city deficit and ROW impacts with construction

San Francisco – Rincon Hill CAC, 4/19/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Question & Answer
- Attendees: 20-25 people
- Main points/issues:
 - 16th Street underpass - Redevelopment Agency staff person stated SF will oppose an alternative with 16th Street depressed.
 - SF representation on TWG/PWG - coordination with City Departments
 - 4th and King redevelopment
 - Jurisdiction from 2nd Street to Transbay
 - Want to schedule more meetings in San Francisco – will coordinate with Redevelopment staff

Mountain View City Council HST Meeting, 4/19/10

- Meeting Format: City Council Meeting
- Attendees: 3 council members; 4 staff; 6 public
- Main points/issues:
 - Questions about who pays for what, how to get public to understand alternatives
 - Requesting CHSRA for money to cover staff time and consultant costs

San Carlos Community Meeting, 4/22/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer
- Attendees: 40 residents, 2 city staff
- Main points/issues:
 - Constructability of alternatives: how to build aerial viaduct, remove berm. Keep Caltrain running and not impact Old County Road?
 - San Carlos Transit Village: community disagreement surfaced regarding project impact to Transit Village land rather than existing neighborhoods to the east of Old County Road, given promises for landscape buffer when the berm was built, that the Transit Village project is not built, the land is vacant and owned by Samtrans.
 - Questions about how/when the economic impact of the project on the cities (i.e. if property values fall because of aerial structures, which impacts property tax revenues), will be considered in the decision-making? Who is responsible for that kind of analysis?

Palo Alto Community Meeting, 4/27/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer, Breakout Session
- Attendees: 111, 5 council members, 2 planning commissioners
- Main points/ issues:
 - Preference for tunnels and underground solutions, dislike for aerial structures and associated noise, vibration and visual impacts
 - Concern about how property owners are compensated for lost value due to noise and visual impact both during and after construction, with ROW width impacts for trench and cut and cover alternatives. Concern about homes not at risk for eminent domain, but those near the ROW. Need answers now to these questions. Need to include property costs in analysis for equal cost comparisons among alternatives.
 - Concern that two tracks for Caltrain will limit future service with no baby bullet
 - Discussion on whether grade separating Palo Road and Alma Street made sense. Discussion that with trenches Oregon Expressway/Embarcadero need to be at grade. What to do to grade separate East Meadow, Churchill and Charleston – aerial and at grade unattractive with concerns about intersection and traffic impacts at Alma (project and construction)
- Breakout sessions included discussions of issues dealing with the selection of the Caltrain route, as well as assessment of the vertical alignments based on noise, visual impact, potential property impacts, and several other issues (for example, safety).

Millbrae Community Meeting, 4/28/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation and Question & Answer
- Attendees: 48, Mayor and three other council members. Attendees consisted of community members, mostly from neighborhoods tight along the alignment.
- Main points/issues:
 - A majority of the questions focused on eminent domain and/or compensating property owners who may have to live with ongoing noise or other negative impacts

Redwood City Community Meeting, 4/29/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer, and Breakout Session. City sponsoring its own workshop on 5/11.
- Attendees: 70 people, Councilmember Gee
- Main points/ issues:
 - Many concerns about property takes and the impacts of a high-speed train station.
 - Support for stopping HST service in San Jose.
 - Because the ROW is very constrained in much of Redwood City, the discussion turned from the regular vertical alternatives to the alternative that stacks 2 trains on top of another 2 trains. This is not covered in detail in the AA, so there was not additional information that the team could provide.
 - Community wants clarification with City Council the City's position regarding wanting a potential HST station, what the benefits and impacts are to neighborhoods.

Mountain View Community Meeting, 5/3/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer, Breakout Session
- Attendees: 150, Council members Ronit Bryant and Laura Macias
- Main points/issues:
 - Concern about how to grade separate Castro Street
 - Concern about the impacts of an at-grade solution at Rengstorff Avenue with depressing Central Expressway
 - Concern about potential ROW impacts to Evelyn and VTA
 - Study below grade options
 - Concerns about noise, visual impact and safety with train derailment
 - Questions about Highways 101 and 280

Atherton Community Meeting, 5/4/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation started but not completed, Question & Answer
- Attendees: 70, one council member
- Main points/issues:
 - The business plan is inadequate
 - The ridership projections overstate the case
 - Transit systems rarely cover their costs or make money
 - The overall statewide budget doesn't include enough money for acceptable solutions for Atherton (or other places – i.e. tunnels)
 - Fears that even if the local team listens to the community, the CHSRA Board will decide
 - Highways 101 and 280 need to be fully evaluated

Burlingame Community Meeting, 5/12/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Question & Answer, Breakout Session
- Attendees: ~100, including at least 3 council members and Mayor
- Main points/issues:
 - Very concerned about visual and noise impact of aerial structure
 - Tunnel is seen as acceptable
 - Concerned that HSRA will default to the cheapest, least desirable alternative

- Concern about heritage trees along ROW

San Mateo Community Meeting, 5/13/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation (Eminent Domain Overview), Small Group, Q&A
- Attendees: about 100 community members, City Staff, a few council members
- Main points/issues:
 - Impacts to economic vitality of downtown area (W. of tracks)
 - Concern on impacts from noise, vibration, visual, and construction
 - Preference for stacked tunnel
 - Concerns on impacts to property values
 - Questions on why at-grade is the only option from 12th to Highway 92

Mission Bay Citizen's Advisory Committee, 5/14/10

- Meeting Format: Committee Meeting
- Attendees: 25 people, including two staff from SF Redevelopment Agency
- Main points/issues:
 - Take into consideration PUC master plan
 - Analysis process for determining the feasibility of each grade separation option?
 - Maintain pedestrian and vehicular at-grade crossing at 7th St. and Commons
 - Transition points where HST will transition from below grade to above grade
 - Analysis of various grade separation options and their impacts to 16th St.

Daly City, Brisbane and the Visitation Valley Community Meeting, 5/15/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A
- Attendees: 43, including City Manager for Daly City
- Main points/issues:
 - Impacts to Brisbane Bayland Project (BBP): must the rail yard/maintenance facility be located in BBP?
 - Rail yard / maintenance facility should provide a community benefit (i.e. jobs) and mitigations for impacts should have a high level of planning
 - General questions on HST project funding and the decision-making process to start HST planning process in San Francisco instead of in other segments

Santa Clara Community Meeting, 5/19/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A, Breakout Session
- Attendees: 20 including Councilmember Jamie Matthews, 2 planning staff
- Main points/issues:
 - Budget, financing
 - Noise
 - Property impacts
 - Questions about HSR + Caltrain integration and coordination
 - Would like tunnels added into consideration in Santa Clara
 - Would like to avoid impacts to the emergency dispatch facility, which is adjacent to ROW

Belmont Community Meeting, 5/26/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A, Breakout Session
- Attendees: 39 community members, Mayor Wozniak, 1 Councilmember, 2 Staff
- Main points/issues:
 - Cost
 - Impact to property values for properties next to ROW
 - Construction impacts
 - Noise

Menlo Park Community Meeting, 6/1/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Q&A, Breakout Session
- Attendees: ~50 people, including Mayor Cline, 1 Councilmember, Main points/issues:
 - Program EIR
 - Ridership
 - ROW needs
 - Tunnels
 - Construction Impacts
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Impacts to property owners along ROW

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Meeting, 6/8/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A
- Attendees: 20 community members and some BOS members
- Main points/issues:
 - North Fair Oaks
 - Desire to include below grade alternatives in North Fair Oaks
 - Concern from North Fair Oaks on shouldering construction impacts for neighboring cities' design solutions
 - Gang issues may be exacerbated if cross-rail pedestrian connections were improved
 - Atherton
 - Business Plan, ridership, 101/280 routes, program EIR
 - Need to maintain freight and Dumbarton rail connections and how they impact HSR options

Sunnyvale Community Meeting, 6/10/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A, Small Group Exercise
- Attendees: 18 community members
- Main points/issues:
 - Connectivity across the city is a major concern. The RR is one of several impediments to connectivity. This project could be an opportunity to remove one of the barriers.
 - Long-term economic opportunities for redevelopment are important (i.e. Jefferson Avenue area in Redwood City)
 - Bike and Pedestrian connectivity is critical in the design of the grade separations.

Sunnyvale City Council Study Session, 6/15/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A
- Attendees: Mayor Hamilton, 5 Councilmembers, 2 City staff, City Attorney, 8 community members
- Main points/issues:
 - If at-grade alternative, then grade separated streets should go under the tracks
 - Please work closely with VTA on bicycle/pedestrian access issues
 - Stations with connectivity to airports are a priority
 - If at-grade alternative, when will it be know if private property acquisitions are needed near the Sunnyvale Caltrain station
 - What measures will ensure the safety of people near tracks

South San Francisco Community Meeting, 6/15/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A
- Attendees: Entire Council, city staff, 6 community members, and Judge Kopp
- Main points/issues:
 - SSF had been working on a grade sep project and a station relocation project with Caltrain before prop 1a and they put that on hold in order to accomodate HSR planning. They want to ensure that their plans get incorporated.

- They are very impacted by existing freight users and do not want continued or worse negative impacts of freight. (Do not want to be a stockyard.)
- Despite mailings to residents, community members don't want to engage on HSR, but don't want that to be interpreted to mean that community planning goals are unimportant.
- The mayor was excited about the possibility that HSR brings to the state.
- Want to use HSR as an impetus to solve existing problems (freight impacts, grade sep, station location, station connectivity, etc.)

San Mateo Community Meeting, 6/16/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Small Groups
- Attendees: 48 people, with 3 councilmembers
- Main points/issues:
 - Focused on the Council recommended alignment and the city's AA response letter
 - Supported the Council position of depressed rail in the north/downtown and accepted, with a bit of reluctance, an aerial in the south.

North Fair Oaks Community Council Meeting, 6/16/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A, Small Groups
- Attendees: 34 attendees including 6 city council members, the county planning director, a legislative aide for a member of the Board of Supervisors and 1 member of the press (The *Almanac*)
- Main points/issues:
 - Concerns about connectivity between HSR, Caltrain and other modes of public transportation. Want to ensure that this project is developed in the context of the greater transit network.
 - Questions about the potential mid-peninsula station and the three possible locations (Redwood City, Palo Alto and Mountain View).
 - Interest in maintaining the potential for the future Dumbarton passenger service.
 - Questions about how to make sure the projects contribute to North Fair Oaks both from a transit service and general livability and quality of life perspective (i.e. noise, visual impact).

Palo Alto Community Meeting (Organized by neighborhood association), 6/19/10

- Meeting Format: Discussion, PRP Exercise 2
- Attendees: 15 attendees, Nadia Naik, Mayor Burt, Councilmember Price
- Main points/issues:
 - Established Values/Goals for the project.
 - Worked thru half of the PRP Exercise 2 (CARRD to complete and distribute).
 - Safe Routes to School is a major issue. Must be addressed during construction.
 - Re-establishment of the existing landscaping (carbon footprint, etc).
 - Equity within the City of Palo Alto (north to south end of the alignment – same solution, if possible).
 - City may undertake a Corridor Study for more urban planning, cross connectivity, etc.
 - Community interested in Caltrain grade separations (diminishing support for HST Deep tunnel).
 - At-grade rail (with road grade separations) has too much ROW impacts.

San Jose Community Meeting, 6/21/10

- Meeting Format: Open House, Presentation, Q&A, Small Groups
- Attendees: approximately 40 participants including one city councilman and 2 city staff.
- Main points/issues:
 - Strong concerns about vibration. Existing vibration impacts to neighborhoods due to freight are severe.
 - Strong concerns about visual impact and privacy impact of aerial structures especially in residential areas.
 - Although noise and vibration are related, the sensitivity was much higher around vibration.
 - Concerns about ROW need, especially at Bellarmine School.

San Francisco Transportation Authority Meeting, 6/29/10

- Meeting Format: Presentation, Q&A
- Attendees: San Francisco Supervisors, Staff, approximately 25 members of the public
- Main points/issues:
 - The design of the grade separation at 16th Street & 7th Street is a vital east-west link. The design of this intersection needs to meet transit and safety needs, but it also needs to meet the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, the potential electrified MUNI bus line, and maintain the development potential of adjacent parcels west of 280.
 - Similar concerns were also voiced about the grade separation at 7th Street and Common Street, which links the northern portion of Mission Bay with the rest of the city.
 - Support for the project and enthusiasm for San Francisco as an anchor High Speed Train station.
 - Potential interest in larger vision for 4th & King Station area.

Attachment 5 – Summary of Written Comments

DATE	COMMENTER	SUMMARY
AGENCIES		
CITY/COUNTY		
12-Apr-10	Kathy McKeithen Town of Atherton	- Design - Tunnel is only acceptable alternative
03-May-10	Carol Anne Painter, City Planner City of Santa Clara 1500 Warburton Avenue Santa Clara, CA 95050	- Design - Prefer Covered Trench/Tunnel - Design & Construction - Concerns about impacts to Police Facility Building and the systems that operate at that facility - Utilities - want to ensure that all alternatives avoid conflicts with existing utilitues as identified. - Utilities - Need to correct ownership of water utlity identified in Appendix D
11-May-10	Robert Weil, Public Works Director/City Engineer City of San Carlos 600 Elm Street San Carlos, CA 94070	- Caltrain - preservation of Caltrain operations important to City goals - Funding - Questions about funding more expensive alternatives - Noise and Vibration - Concerns about noise of vent shafts for below grade alternatives - Design - There are oportunties of an aerial viaduct including more street crossings, better visibility of historic resources, better bicycle and pedestrian connections, increased parking, green street features, and other community amenities - Safety/Health - Concerns about impacts of seismic events on aerial structure and adjacent roadways - Mitigations - Concerns about visual impact of aerial structure and OCS wires. Impacts could be mitigated through design - Property Impacts - Concerns about need for ROW, the preservation of Old County Road, and impacts to the planned San Carlos Transit Village on a temporary or permanent basis
07-Jun-10	Larry Klein, Chaiar HSR Committee City of Palo Alto P.O. Box 10250 Palo Alto, Ca 94303	- Process - Concerns about information in the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and CSS Toolkit

17-Jun-10	Kathy McKeithen, Mayor Town of Atherton	- Process - included scoping comments, PEIR comments, comments on ridership analysis, request for further information on economic impacts - Funding - Concerns about lack of detail in cost estimates, and about availability of funds - Design - prefer a below-grade alternative - Noise and Vibration - concerns about impacts and mitigations
25-Jun-10	John Lee, Mayor City of San Mateo	-Design - Phase construction; analyze / additional info on bored tunnel, especially from Tilton - 12th Ave.; more information on horizontal design; aerial does not conform to SM policy; landscaping/ adequate screening; station configuration / location; bored/trench/tunnel least impacts; impacts to Trinta Park - Public Involvement - Request updated information by 8/30 for 9/30 community workshop - Property Impact - Provide information - Freight - Provide more information on effects of freight operations - Construction - Request feasiblity / constrctability analysis and staging - Funding - More details on alternatives costs - Traffic and Circulation - Examine providing increased east-west connectivity for bikes and peds, especially 9th Ave. to Hayward Park - Environmental Impacts - Reference 16th Ave, 19th Ave, and Laurel Creeks and channels.
28-Jun-10	Cathy Baylock, Mayor City of Burlingame	- Process - Would like more information and analysis - Design - Would like consideration of alternate routes and deep tunnel, prefer covered trench, do not prefer aerial viaduct - Property Impacts - concerns about eminent domain and other impacts to private properties - Noise and Vibration - concerns about impacts - Construction - concerns about impacts during construction period to residents, businesses, schools, and Caltrain operations - Utilities - want to avoid impacts to utilities located in or near the right of way - Caltrain - concerns about level of service, want restoration of service to Broadway station - Freight - concerns about increased freight service - Funding - concerns about overall project cost, right of way costs - Safety/Health - Concerns about hazardous materials in the soil air - Historic/Cultural Resources - concerns about historic train stations and trees - Stations - want more information on platform designs, want more information about Millbrae HST Station - Agency Coordination - should include planned projects in Burlingame, want to continue coordination with neighboring cities - Electrification - ensure coordiantion between HSR and Caltrain electrification, want more electrification data

28-Jun-10	Council Members Redwood City	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Does not divide downtown or communities; maintains grade separations- Construction - Minimize impacts- Property Impacts - Minimize impacts- Freight - Preserve freight to Dumbarton and Seaport spur rails
30-Jun-10	Jack Witthaus, Transportation & Traffic Manager City of Sunnyvale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - request inclusion of stacked trench alternative- Property Impacts - Concerns about impacts to property related to potential lowering of existing grade separations- Energy - want to know locaitons of substations- Traffic & Circulation - support alternatives that provide better cross-track connectivity- Construction - questions about constructure impacts and timeline- Freight - maintain freght rail access- Property Impacts - concerned about property imapcts, especially around Mary Ave.- Design - design should be consistent with local planning and redevelopment efforts- Noise and Vibration - minimize noise impacts- Stations - maintain current platform locations
30-Jun-10	Patrick Burt, Mayor City of Palo Alto	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Support evaluation of alternative routes, prefer below grade alternatives, would like consistent approach to all neighborhoods, need more analysis of alternatives, support shared use - especially if it reduces the number of tracks required,- Station - Palo Alto has not taken a position on whether or not it wants a HST station, need more information- Funding - Need more information on project costs, City does not support financially infeasible project- Noise and Vibration - Need more information on potential impacts- Sensitive Receptors - Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto Medical Foundation, and others- Property Impacts - Concerned and need more information about ROW need
30-Jun-10	Richard Cline, Mayor City of Menlo Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Analyze stacked; depth below San Francisquito Creek; mitigations- Property Impact - Cost of ROW impact- Funding - More detailed info on cost estimates- Construction - Phasing requirements; Caltrain operations- Traffic & Circulation - Impacts to roadways

30-Jun-10	Ronit Bryant, Mayor City of Mountain View	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Prefer open/covered trench; least favorable is aerial; is at-grade from Sunnyvale to Stevens Creek to below-grade at Castro feasible?; AA does not address VTA LRT; what is basis for grades; improve cross-rail connectivity, especially between downtown and Moffet Blvd and between Rengstorff Park and other side of tracks; minimal impact to downtown; minimize impacts from lighting; assess tree removal; concern that aerial would remove existing San Antonio and Shoreline overpasses- Traffic & Circulation - Concern over loss of lane on Central Expy; concern grade seps over/under at-grade would negatively impact bikes, peds, and nearby streets and businesses;- Noise/Vibration - More info to understand impacts- Funding - Under CEQA, cost of mitigations are under CHSRA and not local gov'ts- Construction - Small businesses at risk during long construction periods- Process - Oppose CHSRA making critical decisions before city/residents review all information/data and provide input; timeline/plan for "stitching" exercise; provide tunnel options through MV- Land Use - What are land use opportunites and maintenance responsibilities if aerial structure?
30-Jun-10	Jack Witthaus City of Sunnyvale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Request hybrid trench option be considered between Fair Oaks Ave. and easter city limit; more information needed on horizontal impacts; request substation locations be provided in Sup AA; take into account both physical and visual connectivity; specific request to assess connectivity at Bernardo Ave; retain cross-rail pedestrain connection at Sunnyvale caltrain; city is planning reconfiguration of Lawrence Expressway- Noise and Vibration - Mitigate/minimize noise impacts- Station - Include alternatives that retain existing station locations- Oppose - Any alternative that retains at-grade crossings- Construction - Provide construction impacts- Supports - Retaining freight rail access
30-Jun-10	Richard Gordon County of San Mateo San Mateo, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Prefer trench/tunnel and provide explanation if not selected- Traffic/Circulation - Improve connectivity (only 1 crossing in 1.5 mile stretch) by adding a street crossing and possibly another ped/bike crossing- Service - Provide service since Atherton was closed- Sensitive Receptor - Garfield School- Construction - Request opportunity to comment on construction impacts- Freight - Connection to Dumbarton is unclear- Public Involvement - Request greater effort for public outreach in NFO

30-Jun-10	Ray Razavi City of South San Francisco	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support - Fully supports HSR program; support 4-tracks at same level- Construction - Specify proposed ROW take on west side of tracks N of Oyster Point Blvd- Design - Jet fuel shut off valve near Oyster Point; emergency access utilizing UP ROW area; minimize impact to S. Linden from grade sep; requesting alignment redesign to minimize impact to businesses and properties at S. Linden- Station - Move stations south for proposed station undercrossing/access at Airport Blvd; prefer only one undercrossing as pedestrian access to station from downtown- Freight - Opportunity to remove freight yard out of SSF- Funding - Clarify role of ARRA funding (i.e. what it can/can't fund)
30-Jun-10	City and County of San Francisco San Francisco, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Agency Coordination - Offer assistance from city and county of SF with consideration of alternatives- Design - Concerns regarding vertical alignment; recommend modifications to interstate 280 to avoid alteration to streets- Process - No alternatives being considered that preserved 16th, 7th street and grade- Property Impacts - Trenching of streets will degrade booming Mission Bay area Silicon Valley association of realtors
01-Jul-10	Ronnald Popp, Director of Public Works City of Millbrae	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support - supports the system and alignment through Millbrae- Station - Support Millbrae as a high-speed train station- Design - prefer option that leaves Caltrain at grade and puts high-speed train in a tunnel, must be consistent with city's redevelopment plans- Funding - concerns about fiscal impacts to the city due to operations and maintenance- Utilities - concerns about significant utilities that cross the ROW- Parking - concerned about parking supply and demand- Traffic and Circulation - request for complete traffic study- Noise and vibration - want to avoid or mitigate impacts to the community- Agency coordination - request a cooperative agreement between the city and CHSRA
TRANSPORTATION		
05-May-10	William F. Sherry, A.A.E. Director Aviation San Jose International Airport 1732 N. First Street, Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95112	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Questions about height of tracks versus other portions of aerial structures, Concerns that overall height is unacceptable- Agency Coordination - Aerial configurations may be subject to Federal Aviation Regulatory review- Safety/Health - Need to ensure height of aerial structure does not impact One Engine Inoperative procedures

24-Jun-10	John Ristow Valley Transportation Authority Santa Clara (VTA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support - Generally support the project- Agency Coordination- Need to better understand how the project will impact ongoing transportation systems- Parking - Concerns about how parking impacts of the project will impact availability of parking for patrons of other systems- Stations - Need to better understand impacts integration of multiple transit systems at potential HST stations in Palo Alto, and Mountain View, as the Santa Clara Station and the Diridon Station in San Jose
29-Jun-10	Carter Mau San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Oakland, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Agency Coordination, Design - impact to BART tunnel at Millbrae; BART may want to make minor extension to existing tailtracks near Millbrae; issue w/addition of 2 additional HST tracks above San Bruno BART tunnel; clarify assumptions for future BART service; BART @ SJD- Construction - List of structures that must remain functional during construction- Service - Provide ridership information
30-Jun-10	Fred Blackwell, John Rahaim, Jose Luis Moscovich & Nathaniel Ford SFMTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency) San Francisco, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Maintain 16th, 7th, and Common Streets at-grade; consider both minor and major modifications to I-280
OTHER AGENCIES		
26-Apr-10	Scott Laurence San Mateo Union High School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - prefers deep bored tunnel alignment- Sensitive Receptors - two high schools along the alignment- Noise and Vibration - concerned about noise and vibration impacts- Traffic and Circulation - concerned about potential impacts on safe routes to school- Safety/Health - concerned about hazardous materials disruption- Electrification - questions about potential health impacts of electrification technology- Funding - requests a \$75M allocation for mitigations
29-Jun-10	Kevin Skelly Palo Alto Unified School District Palo Alto, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Sensitive Receptor - Palo Alto High School- Noise and Vibration - Need more info on impacts- Design - Mitigations- Traffic and Circulation - Bike/ped/vehicle access for school
ORGANIZATIONS		
18-May-10	Douglas Graham Palo Alto Historical Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Historical/Cultural Resources - list of historic resources in PA provided; worried about noise/vibration impacts
24-May-10	Jim Goddard HP Pavilion, San Jose, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design - Concern of impacts of shallow tunnel and deep tunnel to HP (parking, access, potential for expansion)- Construction - Deep tunnel would cross contaminated soil below HP parking
26-May-10	Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee Corinne Woods, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Traffic & Circulation - Concerns about any alternative that would put vehicle or pedestrian traffic below grade at 16th & 7th Street Intersection or Berry & 7th Street intersections- Support - Support the project- Caltrain - Support Caltrain electrification

28-May-10	Beth Bunnenberg Palo Alto, CA 94301	- Historical/Cultural Resources - list of historic resources in PA provided; worried about noise/vibration impacts
21-Jun-10	Joseph Putnam Putnam Dealer Group Burlingame, CA	- Construction - Concern for space taken by shoe-fly tracks - Funding - Overall cost concerns regarding allocation/priority of state money - Oppose - All high speed rail designs - Property Impacts - Large concern for land consumed in development; believe it will lead to personal business closing, layoffs, and decreased tax revenue for city
21-Jun-10	Ben Cheyette San Francisco, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is not preferred, Open Trench is not preferred, Closed Trench is preferred, Hybrid Trench/stacked is preferred. Supports mitigation with bike path system (Burke-Gilman Trail/Seattle) on Caltrain ROW - Funding - Cost and funding concerns
22-Jun-10	Barbara French, Vice Chancellor University of California San Francisco - UCSF	- Traffic & Circulation - Concerns about intersection at 16th and & 7th Streets
28-Jun-10	John Hofer Charleston Meadows Association Palo Alto, CA 94306	- Design - Aerial strucde alternative will destroy the character of the Chareston Meadows Neighborhood - Traffic and Circulation - Opposes at-grade alternative with grade separation of roadways as this option makes roadways inaccessible to the elderly and physically challenged - Noise and Vibration - Increased noise and vibration would impact use of Robles Park - Traffic and Circulation - Grade crossings at Meadow and Chareston are the main access streets to and from Gunn High School - Design - Provides a list of selection criteria in selecting an alternative. The selection criteria includes property impacts, noise, visual, vibration, safety, traffic & circulation, use of public funds, construction impacts, and air pollution - Design - Opposes Aerial Viaduct, At-Grade, and Deep Tunnel. Prefers Open Trench and Coverd Trench. Suggests Partially Open Cut and Cover extending under the existing ROW and Alma Street
28-Jun-10	Dan Murphy San Francisco, CA	- Design - Opposd to above ground alternatives at 16th Street in San Francisco - Property Impacts - Concerned about the impacts to potential future development in this area
30-Jun-10	Greg Greenaway Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group Redwood City, CA	- Support - support the project - Caltrain - support electrification project - Freight - consider the existing freight users, as well as future potential fro freight, consider impacts to railyards - Process - would like "compatibility with freight rail service" added as an evaluation measure - Design - need preserve connectivity to Port of Redwood City and Dumbarton line through at-grade alignments

30-Jun-10	William Phillips Stanford University Palo Alto, CA	- Agency Coordination - Coordination of transit systems w/Caltrain and HSR not addressed - Property Impacts - Minimize impacts to Stanford owned land (revenue impacts could be significant) - Traffic/Circulation - Encourage design for safe passes across rail for peds and bikes - Historic/Cultural Resources - Preserve PA station (assumed but not stated in AA)
30-Jun-10	Adam Montgomery Silicon Valley Association of Realtors Cupertino, CA	- Caltrain - Alterations will have adverse land effects - Construction - Effects will have adverse land effects - Noise and Vibration - Will have adverse land effects - Process - Overall recommendation for alternatives analysis to look at criteria important to community; inadequate/ inconsistent analysis of land use issues including cost estimates - Property Impacts - Project impacts already considered will have adverse effects on land use, affecting available space, development, accessibility, property value; high community concerns regarding these - Traffic and Circulation - Effects will have adverse land effects
30-Jun-10	Josh Smith Walden Development Inc. San Francisco, CA	- Design - Retain 16th St. at-grade crossing in SF due to impacts to properties, businesses, connectivity; request tunnels
30-Jun-10	Janel Carpinelli, President Dogpatch Neighborhood Association San Francisco, CA	- Traffic and Circulation - Concerned about impacts to 16th Street - Design - Supports trenching the rail, leaving 16th Street at grade - Support - Supports high-speed rail
30-Jun-10	Greg Greenway Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group	- Freight - maintain future freight rail service; considering allowing operations outside of 12am - 5pm designated time; - Design - Make freight rail compatibility an explicit "evaluation measure"; OCS should comply with existing state safety regulations which require 22.5ft. high; flexibility in 1% grade
01-Jul-10	William H. Cutler Charleston Meadows Neighborhood Association Palo Alto, CA	- Design - Prefer trechn, cut and cover or partially covered trench, potential for 3-track system - Construction - consider phased implementation, minimize disruption - Property Impacts - concerns about property impacts of grade separations - Noise and Vibration - concerns about noise impacts to indoor and outdoor spaces - Air Quality - protect the air quality of the community - Safety/Health - improve safety at crossings - Traffic and Circulation - maintain or improve traffic circulation - Safety/Health - prevent crive - Caltrain - support maximum interoperability

01-Jul-10	Fran Taylor CC Puede San Francisco, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency Coordination - Offer assistance for looking towards solutions - Support - HSR - Traffic and Circulation - Concerns for San Francisco area being isolated/divided; suggest looking at alternatives
01-Jul-10	Daniel Krause, Co-Founder & Vice Chair Californians for High Speed Rail San Francisco, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Increase scope of project planning - Agency Coordination - Increase coordination with transit operators on the corridor - Design - Rethink some current assumptions to build the most flexible and interoperable system - Stations - More interoperability between Caltrain and high-speed service can be explored
INDIVIDUAL		
14-Apr-10	William H. Warren Palo Alto, CA 94306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ridership - Concerns that actual ridership will be lower than projections - Design - Four tracks not necessary - Construction - Suggestions for phasing due to funding constraints - Funding - Concerns about availability of grants
27-Apr-10	Arthur Keller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design – 6D-2: questions grade separation at East Meadow and Charleston, 6A: constructability of Alma Street/Palo Alto Avenue underpass, 6D-4: should refer to Charleston Road rather than Barron Creek. Comments that a transition from below grade to at-grade profile can happen between Adobe Creek and San Antonio Rd, 6A, 6C: Consider potential re-use of right-of-way above the covered trench/tunnel, 6C: Consider an alternative in which HST and Caltrain go from at-grade to below-grade between Matadero and East Meadow - Construction – AA should consider factors for maintaining operations during construction. AA should consider temporary easements for shoofly tracks, access for construction and constructability - Cultural and Historical Resources- Impacts to El Palo Alto tree. Tunnel Option has lower impacts on Cultural resources and parklands - Traffic and Circulation – Traffic impacts around the Palo Alto station. Connectivity to Palo Alto Avenue, El Camino Real, Alma Street, Embarcadero Road, and San Antonio Road - Stations – Impacts to Sanford station - Wildlife – Tunnel option would have least impacts on critical habitat - Safety/Health – Tunnel option is better than trench option for keeping the public away from potential hazardous materials - Funding – Provide quantitative cost information rather than qualitative information, 6D: Explain why covered trench/tunnel is more expensive than Deep Tunnel - Noise and Vibration – Does Tunnel Option have low vibration impacts as Deep Tunnel? - Environmental Justice – Above-grade option in 6D discriminates South Palo Alto residents if 6A and 6B are below ground

28-Apr-10	Stephen Godfrey	- Design - Oppose At- or above-grade options, Prefer below-grade options
06-May-10	Kathy Hamilton Menlo Park CA	- Design - Best option for North San Mateo is the trench and cover option, aerial or open trench option will divide neighborhoods, and the neighborhoods will deteriorate, likes a linear park above through tracks
11-May-10	Shue Ho Millbrae, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding - Concerned about the cost of the system - Oppose - Project benefits are not worth the cost
12-May-10	Tiffney Mortensen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefer an underground tunnel. At-grade option is better than an elevated track - Station - Support Mountain View Station
12-May-10	Jane Beyer Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose - Opposes the project - Noise and Vibration - Concerns about noise impacts
12-May-10	Bill Beyer Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose - Stop the high-speed trains in San Jose - Air Quality - New systems will promote travel, we should encourage less travel
13-May-10	Barbara Hewitt Burlingame, CA	- Caltrain - We don't need another system, demand can be met by Caltrain
30-May-10	David Herz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mitigation - If at-grade option is selected, access to Park Blvd to Charleston may be cut off to minimize the displacement of adjacent properties - Design - Ranking of five vertical alignment preference from best to worst; covered trench, open trench, deep tunnel, at-grade, aerial; important criteria for ranking are visual, noise and property disruption - Noise and Vibration - Noise level will increase - Property Impacts - Loss of property value, compensation for property loss damages - Design - Structures and trains should not block views
01-Jun-10	Thomas Burn San Mateo CA 94401	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ROW - eminent domain on property - Safety/Health - Arsenic along ROW, potential increase in deaths/suicides - Sensitive Receptors - schools impacted by noise of construction and operations - Environmental Justice - minority/low-income families along ROW not provided information on eminent domain
01-Jun-10	Lois Giovacchini Palo Alto, CA	- Oppose - Opposes high-speed rail north of San Jose
04-Jun-10	Craig and Donna Largent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Freight - Costs of purchasing buying out The access rights of The Freight rail, impacts to Freight rail - Vibration - impacts Vibration from The Freight trains on HST operations - Design - Deep tunnel option should be analyzed considering Caltrain operation

06-Jun-10	Juan Napoles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Like covered trench/tunnel alternative from downtown San Mateo to Burlingame. Also like a linear park above the cut and cover alternative - Noise and Vibration - Above-grade option will increase noise level - Safety - HST will change community character by replacing good homeowners and renters with problematic ones
08-Jun-10	Janel Nestler San Mateo, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Need a clear comment period deadline for AA Report, the Authority should have stopped the Program-Level EIR until the Program-Level EIR is re-certified, there are multiple violation of AB3034, including only one option, which is on Union Pacific (UP) trackage is a mistake, as UP may come up with a major objection, AA report presents design alternatives, but it does not touch other alternatives, i.e., routes, AA Report does not address Altamont Pass Alternative via Dumbarton Bridge - Ridership - The Authority does not have an investment grade ridership study - Design - Tunneling through the peninsula is only solution to the Pacheco Pass alternative - Biological Resources - At or above grade options will destroy trees. - Funding - Full net cost should be prepared - Noise and Vibration - Trains will be extremely loud - Design - Discuss alternatives that would reduce the number of tracks to less than four - Property Impacts - Real estate values are decreasing along the Caltrain route
08-Jun-10	Jeffery Hardoin San Mateo, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Supports Cut and Cover Tranch option - Property Impacts - Concerns about impacts to residential property of above grade alternatives
14-Jun-10	Helen Stevens Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose - Opposes Caltrain alignment
18-Jun-10	Anna Cadona Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Open Trench(Most favored), Closed Trench & Hybrid Trench (2nd favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Factors considered when ranking designs - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process- Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking

18-Jun-10	Barrie Mengarelli Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench (Most favored), Hybrid Trench (2nd favored); Oppose: Aerial Viaduct (least favored), Open Trench(2nd least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Factors considered when ranking designs - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking
18-Jun-10	Karen Sparks Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Leslie Reisfeld Burlingame, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Iavor Boyanov Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Jennifer Slaboda Burlingame, CA 94110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Lynn Israelit Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Margaret Ryalls Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
18-Jun-10	Steve and Koann Skrzyniarz Burlingame, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

18-Jun-10	Iavor Boyanov Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers closed trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Kim & Glen Bentley	- Prefers stacked - Funding: overall concern of cost and management
19-Jun-10	Larisa Yagolnitser Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Victor Neculai Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Alexandra and Joshua Galanter Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Melissa Germaine Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Les Terry, Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Vladimir Weinstein Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	James Wald Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - Opposes Caltrain alignment - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Tom Feeney Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

19-Jun-10	Trina Ingle-Cabreros Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	D. R. Labrador Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Does not support any alternatives - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Jim Edwards Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Rick Quintana	- Design - Prefers Stacked Trench
19-Jun-10	Jane Dunbar Burlingame, CA	- Property Impacts - Concerned about property impacts near ROW - Noise and Vibration- Concerns about potential impacts - Design - Prefers below grade alternatives - Funding - Concerned about cost of the system - Support - Supports high-speed train concept
19-Jun-10	Pat Giorni Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternatives Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR, should consider alternate alignments, concerned about CSS process, concerned about TWG and PWG group - Funding - Concerned about cost of project and burden on cities - Design - Prefers deep tunnel alternative
19-Jun-10	Mel and Chris Bebbington San Mateo, CA	- Oppose - Opposes Caltrain alignment - Design - Supports below grade alternatives - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	Betty Blumer Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
19-Jun-10	William Blumer Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Laura & Patrick Somers Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Does not prefer any alternative (though rates closed trench highest) - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

20-Jun-10	Susan Castner-Paine Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Violations to Prop 1A - deep tunneling eliminated w/o adequate explanation; environmental impacts to due elevated options not yet analyzed; no realistic analysis of impact to Caltrain service; no realistic acceptance of minimum requierments of freight
20-Jun-10	Jim and Teresa Boland	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Aerial Viaduct is least preferred, Open trench and closed trench options are not preferred, Hybrid trench is somewhat preferred - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Patrick Doherty	- Design - Oppose aerial viaduct and open trench; minimal support for closed trench. - Funding - Only 12 million dollar of the estimated 42 million dollars are secured so far - Sensitive Receptor - Burlingame High school, McKinley and Washington and other historic libraries - Design - Light pollution - Property Impacts - Use of eminent domain - Cultural and Historical Resources - Removal of heritage trees
20-Jun-10	Michelle Vanryswyk	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Reneee Ballinger	- Process - Alternative Analysis should come after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench followed by Hybrid Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Leslie McQuaide	- Process - Alternative Analysis should come after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Susan Summe	- Process - Alternative Analysis should come after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

20-Jun-10	David Beach	- Process - Alternative Analysis should come after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Narrowly prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far - Historical and Cultural Resource - Impacts to Washington Park and Burlingame Station - Sensitive Receptor - Impacts to Burlingame High school - Property Impacts - Impacts to residential and business properties, eminent domain
20-Jun-10	David Harris	- Process - Alternative Analysis should come after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Hybrid Trench followed by Closed Trench, opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far - Construction - Health impacts from dust, noise and vibration caused by construction - Public involvement - CSS toolkit was not user friendly
20-Jun-10	Mark Alferman	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Ted McNamara	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conductedafter re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Hybrid Trench followed by Closed Trench, opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
20-Jun-10	Dan Burdick	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far - Funding - HST will not generate enough money to cover its operation
20-Jun-10	Martin Cohen	- Health and Safety - Caltrain and HST may have accidents - Design - Support underground
20-Jun-10	Amy Lennane	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers a tunnel - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

20-Jun-10	Brian Vina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench followed by Hybrid Trench; opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far - Oppose - HST through Burlingame
20-Jun-10	Nancy Edwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - HST - Design - Prefers Closed Trench followed by Hybrid Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far - Historical and Cultural Resources - Impacts to Washington Park, Lion's Club, Burlingame Station, Entryway to Burlingame Avenue - Property Impacts - Decline of property values
20-Jun-10	Kevin Lemire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design, - Supports - Closed Trench(most favored), Hybrid Trench (2nd favored); Opposed:Open Trench (2nd least favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise & Vibration- reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment; - Process - believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - reasons for ranking alternatives
20-Jun-10	Cathy Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench & Hybrid Trench(most favored) Open Trench (2nd least favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored); - Funding - cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise & Vibration - reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment; - Process - believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - reasons for ranking alternatives

20-Jun-10	Melissa Seicher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Preferences are Closed Trench(most favored), Hybrid Trench (2nd favored)Open Trench (2nd least favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic; funding should be accounted for - Opposed- The current Caltrain alignment - Process - believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts - concerns of community protection; contribute to opinion of Aerial Viaduct - Safety/Health - Concerns contribute to opinions of Closed Trench and Open Trench alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Concerns about high school
20-Jun-10	Cindy Berenstein-Sibley Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Hybrid Trench(Most favored), Closed Trench (2nd favored); Oppose: Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise and Vibration - Factors considered when ranking design - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking
21-Jun-10	John Traynor Palo Alto, CA 94306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefers cut and cover - Safety/Health - Risk of derailment, risk of suicides at grade crossings; safety risks for underground alignment - Property Impacts - Impacts to/acquisition of private property - Noise/Vibration - Increased due to increased frequency
21-Jun-10	Jennifer LeBlanc Burlingame, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Mostly prefers stacked solution - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	R. Horak Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - No options should be considered unless freight trains are included

21-Jun-10	Susan Castner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Caltrain - Concerns of service effects Design-recommendation is for underground segment - Noise and Vibration - Unrealistic estimations - Property Impacts - Concerns of community division - Process - Deep tunneling rejection not explained; above ground environmental impacts need to be analyzed; analysis overall not thorough enough; Proposition 1-A being taken advantage of - Sensitive Receptors - Concerns about schools parks and hospitals - Historical and Cultural Resources - concerns about plantings with historic value
21-Jun-10	Stewart Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench (most favored),Hybrid Trench(2nd favored) Opposed: Aerial Viaduct (2nd least favored),Open Trench(least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Historic and Cultural Resources - Closed trench alternative preserves these - Noise and Vibration - An issue for Aerial Viaduct - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts - Details extensive visual impacts from viaduct, open Trench not fitting for Burlingame environment; - Safety/Health - Concerns for Open Trench
21-Jun-10	David Istock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Supports Hybrid Trench and Closed Trench; Opposed: Open Trench and Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – Reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Reasons for ranking alternatives

21-Jun-10	Jeff Carter Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency Coordination - Fears faulty planning will extend BART into Burlingame - Caltrain - Tunneling will negatively affect Caltrain, though Caltrain has potential to prosper along with HSR - Construction - Fears construction disrupting Caltrain - Design - Against Tunnel; Caltrain should be electrified and grade separate; prefers route to Altamont; route ending in San Jose is incomprehensible - Funding - Contingency plan needed - Noise and Vibration - Grade separation eliminates this - Property Impacts - Is not concerned project will have many, unlike dissenters - Public Involvement - Describes hysterical concerns from residents but also a lack of authority addressing these questions/misinformation; believes authority should address some questions - Safety - Grade separation ensures this - Station - Desires station in Burlingame and return of service to Broadway station
21-Jun-10	Brian Poll Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Hybrid Trench(Most favored);Opposed: Closed Trench (3rd least favored), Open Trench (2nd least favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; the Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise and Vibration - Reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – Reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Reasons for ranking alternatives
21-Jun-10	Huifen Chen Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Hybrid Trench(Most favored), Closed Trench (2nd favored); Opposed: The current Caltrain alignment; Open Trench and Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; the Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise and Vibration - Reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – Reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Reasons for ranking alternatives

21-Jun-10	Pam Lampkin Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Open Trench (2nd favored), Closed Trench (Most favored), Oppose: Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Reasons for ranking alternatives - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – Reasons for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Reasons for ranking alternatives
21-Jun-10	Jim Vangele Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Believes underground Covered Railway only option - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Concerned will be impacted - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – Concerned will be impacted - Sensitive Receptors - Concerned will be impacted
21-Jun-10	Julie Baird Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench (Most favored), Hybrid Trench(2nd favored), Open Trench(3rd favored), Aerial Viaduct (least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Noise and Vibration - Factors in ranking alternatives - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including community development, and visual impacts are factors for ranking alternatives - Sensitive Receptors - Factors in ranking alternatives
21-Jun-10	William Schmid Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefer Closed or Open Trench - Funding - Overall cost concerns regarding allocation/priority of state money - Noise and Vibration - Factors/reasons for ranking alternatives - Property Impacts – These including visual impacts are factors/reasons for supporting and opposing

21-Jun-10	Minesh Shah Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench (Most favored), Hybrid Trench (2nd favored); Oppose: Aerial Viaduct (least favored), Open Trench(2nd least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Factors/reasons considered when ranking designs - Opposed- The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – these including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking
21-Jun-10	Hillary Milks Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench & Hybrid Trench(Most favored); Oppose: Aerial Viaduct (least favored), Open Trench(2nd least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic. - Noise and Vibration - Factors considered when ranking designs - Opposed - The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking
21-Jun-10	Stephanie Shah Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Closed Trench (Most favored), Hybrid Trench (2nd favored); Aerial Viaduct (least favored), Open Trench(2nd least favored) - Funding - Cost concerns regarding additional funds needed; The Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Noise and Vibration - Factors/reasons considered when ranking designs - Opposed- The current Caltrain alignment - Process - Believes route decision should precede Alternatives Analysis - Property Impacts – These including visual are factors considered when ranking - Sensitive Receptors - Factors considered when ranking
21-Jun-10	Bonnie Lemon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Rated alternatives; Aerial Viaduct least preferred, Open Trench is a low preference, Hybrid Trench/stacked, high preference, Closed Trench is the best option - Funding - Cost and funding concerns

21-Jun-10	Jeff Londer Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct least preferred, Open Trench low preference, Closed Trench medium preference, Hybrid Trench/stacked is a high preference, Deep Bore Tunnel is the best alternative. - Funding - Cost and funding concerns
21-Jun-10	Diane Kauffman-McGary Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is <i>not</i> preferred, Open Trench is not preferred, Closed Trench is preferred, Hybrid Trench/stacked is preferred. - Funding - Cost and funding concerns
21-Jun-10	Don and Annette Holthaus Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct least preferred, Open Trench low preference, Closed Trench is the best alternative, Hybrid Trench/stacked is a high preference - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns.
21-Jun-10	Jack McHenry Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is not a preference, Open Trench is not a preference, Closed Trench is not a preference, Hybrid Trench/stacked is not a preference, stop HSR in San Jose - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns
21-Jun-10	Patrick and Laurel Kane Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is the best option for both HSR and Caltrain, Open Trench is the least preferred, Closed Trench is a low preference, Hybrid Trench/stacked is a high preference, stop HSR in San Jose - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns
21-Jun-10	Xavier Minakawa Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification, concerns about planning and decision transparency - Design - Aerial Viaduct is the least preferred, Open Trench is a low preference, Closed Trench is a good alternative, Hybrid Trench/stacked is the best alternative - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns
21-Jun-10	Eugene Podkaminer Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is the least preferred, Open Trench is a low preference, Closed Trench is a good alternative, Hybrid Trench/stacked is the best alternative - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns
21-Jun-10	John Pivrotto Burlingame, CA	- Process - AA should have been done after PEIR recertification - Design - Aerial Viaduct is the least preferred, Open Trench is a low preference, Closed Trench is a better alternative, Hybrid Trench/stacked is the best, but not preferred - Funding - Cost and available funding concerns

21-Jun-10	James Diamond Jr Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Does not prefer any alternatives - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Hogan Flake Burlingame, CA	- Design - Prefers Closed Trench, opposes Aerial Viaduct and stacked hybrid, ok with trench if Baby Bullet can overtake
21-Jun-10	Linda Hower Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Christine Pagani San Mateo, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - Opposes all alternatives; likes HST underground below Caltrain - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Dan & Laura Berterretche Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Alison Lemire Burlingame, CA 94010	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Linda DeWitt Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Jasmin Schwarz Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and hybrid trench - stacked, opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Karl Wiley Burlingame, CA	- Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench, opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

21-Jun-10	Gregory Frazer Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and stacked. Opposes Aerial Viaduct and Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Peggy McLaughlin Hillsborough, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Design preferences from most to least preferred are Closed Trench, Hybrid Trench, Open Trench, Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Reese Foster Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Design preferences from most to least preferred are Closed Trench, Hybrid Trench, Open Trench, Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Pat Belding Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench, but does not prefer Open Trench or Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Kathleen Pendergraft Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench, but does not prefer Open Trench or Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Beth Beisecker Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench, but does not prefer Open Trench or Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Brian Cabrerios Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench, but opposes Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's Business Plan is vague and optimistic
21-Jun-10	T. Yamashita Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench, but does not prefer Aerial Viaduct, Open Trench or Hybrid Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's Business Plan is vague and optimistic

21-Jun-10	Kate Belding Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Hybrid Trench, but does not prefer Open Trench or Aerial Viaduct - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Wing Yee Au-Yeung Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Does not prefers Closed Trench, Hybrid Trench, Aerial Viaduct nor Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's Business Plan is vague and optimistic
21-Jun-10	Shirley Eigenbrot Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR -Design - Prefers Closed Trench, followed by Hybrid Trench, but does not prefer Aerial Viaduct nor Open Trench -Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's Business Plan is vague and optimistic
21-Jun-10	Sarah Cheyette Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - HST on Peninsula. - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Tim Chafee Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose - High-Speed Train and Caltrain alignment
21-Jun-10	Jacqueline Haggarty Hillsborough, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Hybrid Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Kerri Belluomini Buringame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Jim Smolinski Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Karen Sparks Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Hybrid Trench or Aerial Structure - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

21-Jun-10	Robin Whittaker Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
21-Jun-10	Ernest Ribera Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Endorses The Burlingame City Council to give appropriate Authority to speak for The residents
21-Jun-10	Laura Simmons/Catherine Glaze Burlingame, CA 94011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Program EIR - Prefers an alignment not on Caltrain - Public Involvement - Consider community concerns - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic - Design - Prefers Closed Trench, followed by Hybrid Trench. Does not prefer Aerial Viaduct or Open Trench
21-Jun-10	Alex and Rachel Emanuel Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench and Open Trench, followed by Hybrid Trench, does not prefer Aerial Viaduct or Open Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far, the Authority's business plan is vague and optimistic
22-Jun-10	Thomas Paine Burlingame, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program Level EIR - Does not provide info to support PEIR rejection of Altamont and 280/101 routes - Caltrain - Does not provide info supporting CHSRA's view that HST is essential to maintain Caltrain service - Business Plan - Unreasonable - Design - Rejected deep tunnel w/o supporting info - Visual Impact - Aerial - Operations - does not adequately consider terminating at SJD
22-Jun-10	Gary Hom Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - High-speed train
23-Jun-10	Robert and Marian Stein Burlingame, CA 94010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Oppose - HST on Peninsula - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
23-Jun-10	Amelia Nash Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Closed Trench or Hybrid Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
24-Jun-10	Donna Hower Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Does not prefer Caltrain route - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

25-Jun-10	Ricky Chiu Palo Alto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefers covered trench/tunnel or deep tunnel alternatives - Traffic and Circulation - concerns about potential traffic impacts if lanes of Alma are used for ROW
25-Jun-10	Greg & Barbara Jones Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Covered Trench/Tunnel - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
27-Jun-10	Beth Bunnenberg Palo Alto, CA 94301	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Involvement - Completed community workshop group exercise
27-Jun-10	Tori Peterson Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Covered Trench or Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
28-Jun-10	Hinda G. Sack Charleston Meadows Association Palo Alto, Ca 94306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Aerial strucde alternative will destroy the character of the Chareston Meadows Neighborhood. - Traffic & Circulation - Opposes at-grade alternative with grade separation of roadways as this option makes roadways inaccessible to the elderly and physically challenged - Noise & Vibration - Increased noise and vibration would impact use of Robles Park - Traffic & Circulation - Grade crossings at Meadow and Chareston are the main access streets to and from Gunn High School. - Design - Provides a list of selection criteria in selecting an alternative. The selection criteria includes property impacts, noise, visual, vibration, safety, traffic & circulation, use of public funds, construction impacts, and air pollution. - Design - Opposes Aerial Viaduct, At-Grade, and Deep Tunnel. Prefers Open Trench and Coverd Trench. Suggests Partially Open Cut and Cover extending under the existing ROW and Alma Street
28-Jun-10	Jeff Eliason Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far

29-Jun-10	Roger Sack Palo Alto, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Aerial strucde alternative will destroy the character of the Chareston Meadows Neighborhood - Traffic & Circulation - Opposes at-grade alternative with grade separation of roadways as this option makes roadways inaccessible to the elderly and physically challenged - Noise & Vibration - Increased noise and vibration would impact use of Robles Park - Traffic & Circulation - Grade crossings at Meadown and Chareston are the main access streets to and from Gunn High School. - Design - Provides a list of selection criteria in selecting an alternative. The selection crteria includes property impacts, noise, visual, vibration, safety, traffic & circulation, use of public funds, construction impacts, and air pollution - Design - Opposes Aerial Viaduct, At-Grade, and Deep Tunnel; prefers Open Trench and Coverd Trench; suggests Partially Open Cut and Cover extending under the existing ROW and Alma Street
29-Jun-10	Margaret Farney Burlingame, CA 94401	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR. - Design - Design preferences from most to least preferred are Hybrid Trench, Closed Trench, Open Trench, Aerial Viaduct. - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far.
29-Jun-10	John Traynor Palo Alto CA 94306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefer Cut and Cover alternative through most of Palo Alto, except for Menlo Park border area, where at grade is prefered due to concerns about the creeks and El Palo Alto tree - Traffic & Circulation / Station - tram and shuttle options may lessen traffic and parking concerns realted to potential Palo Alto HSR station - Design - suggests "tuck under" alternative
29-Jun-10	Dennis P Burlingame City, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process - Alternative Analysis should have been conducted after re-certification of PEIR - Design - Prefers Hybrid Trench - Funding - Only 12 billion dollars of the estimated 42 billion dollars is secured so far
29-Jun-10	Anita Axt Burlingame, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support - California needs a high-speed train - Funding - Need to seek federal funding - Design - Utilize existing infrastructure
29-Jun-10	Jim & Gail McFall Palo Alto, CA 94306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property Impact - Provide actual ROW widths and horizontal alignment; impacts/takes - Noise/Vibration - Provide more impact information - Safety - Provide more info on safety for Southgate and PAHS - Design - Provide vertical heights of alignment and OCS; evaluate visual impacts
30-Jun-10	Laurie Herzi Palo Alto, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property Impacts - Wants to move forward with alternatives that protect private property and limit ROW impacts, explore potential of relocating driveways to maintain so that fewer properties are impacted,attractive visual and sound mitigations should be built into design through the use of living walls

30-Jun-10	James Jonas Redwood City, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Prefers Stacked Trench alternative, analyze alternatives based on providing community benefits such as increased open space or minimizing noise impacts - Funding - Suggests a series of cost saving strategies including phased implementation, shared platforms and partnership with BART
30-Jun-10	Joey D'Angelo Charles M. Salter Associates Inc. San Francisco, CA 94104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Opposd to above ground alternatives at 16th Street in San Francisco - Noise and Vibration - Concerns about noise and vibration impacts of above ground solutions - Property Impacts - Concerned about the impacts to potential future development in this area
30-Jun-10	Reinhard Clever, Ph.D. Hayward, CA 94545	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Concerned about platform configuration and station design, should be designed based on pulsed hub theory as demonstrated in Switzerland - Process - Concerns about the ability to create one seat rides, which would create more demand
30-Jun-10	Leannah Hunt International President's Premier Agent Palo Alto, CA 94301	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support - Supports concept of high-speed rail, but is concerned about property impacts - Property Impacts - Concerned about loss in property values to homes along ROW - Noise and Vibration - Concerned about potential impacts - Freight - Concerned about increase in freight use of the alignment - Design - Could support below grade alternatives
16-Jul-10	M. Craggs San Jose, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design - Oppose any elevated design; supports fully underground design, believes there is no reason this is not possible - Funding - Costs are inaccurate; real costs of property impacts must be included which will actually make underground design less costly - Noise and Vibration - Impacts that will result from elevated design Process-need to next evaluate a design that does not impact communities - Property Impacts - Impacts including light pollution and visual that will result from elevated design - Safety - Will be compromised by elevated design